

REMARKS

Claim 30 is canceled. Claims 32 and 33 are newly added. Claim 31 is amended. Therefore, the claims now pending are claims 25–29 and 31–33.

A marked up copy of amended claim 31 is appended to this Amendment.

Claims 31–33

Claim 31, as amended, is directed to a method of making an RFID transceiver by the steps of mounting an RFID transceiver integrated circuit on one half of a sheet and folding the sheet in half.

Newly added dependent claim 32 and newly added apparatus claim 33 further recite aligning the two halves so that the folding step makes an electrical connection between a first contact on the first half of the sheet and a second contact on the second half of the sheet (as supported in the specification at page 26, line 29 – page 27, line 7 and in Figure 11). An advantage of the invention, as stated in the specification at page 8, lines 19–20 and 23–24, is that providing direct electrical connection between abutting contacts on two halves of the sheet allows the two circuits to be connected without conducting electrical current through the fold of the sheet, which would be unreliable because of mechanical stresses at the location of the fold.

Claim 31 was rejected as unpatentable over either Baker or Reeb. Both references disclose folding a sheet in half to form a passive inductor-capacitor (L-C) circuit without an integrated circuit or any other active components. Therefore, the references fail to suggest manufacturing an active RFID circuit that includes an RFID integrated circuit as in claim 31.

In addition, the prior art designs lack any direct electrical contact between the two halves of the sheet. Instead, a gap is intentionally left between the two sheets to function as the dielectric of the capacitance between the two halves. Therefore, the references fail to suggest the invention of claims 32 and 33 in which a direct electrical connection between the two halves advantageously permits connecting circuitry on the two halves without the need to conduct current flow through the fold.

Therefore, claims 31–33 are patentable.

Claims 25, 27 and 28

Claims 25, 27 and 28 are directed to a method and apparatus in which a plurality of RFID transceivers are mounted on a sheet and stored within a RF shielded dispenser. An advantage of the invention is that it prevents the transceivers from responding to RF interrogation signals until they are ready to be deployed by removing them from the RF shielded dispenser.

Claims 25, 27 and 28 were rejected as unpatentable over Reeb in view of Baro. However, both references completely lack any disclosure related to RF shielding, which is the heart of the

claimed invention. The Examiner asserts it would be obvious to protect RF markers from exposure to radio frequency until use. However, such a rejection is improper unless the references themselves motivate the invention. Since the references lack even the slightest suggestion of RF shielding, the references cannot be considered to motivate the invention. Absent such motivation, the rejection is based on nothing more than the Examiner's speculation and hindsight. Therefore, claims 25, 27 and 28 are patentable.

Claims 26 and 29

The Examiner found that claims 26 and 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, since claims 26 and 29 are dependent on claims 25 and 28, respectively, they should be patentable without being rewritten in independent form because claims 25 and 28 are patentable as argued above.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Stern
Attorney for Applicant
Registration no. 29,703
Tel. (650) 365-4880